

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated October 1, 2003, claims 1-4 were pending.

In this Amendment, claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate support for the amendment can be found in, for example, Fig. 1A.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wada et al.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Wada et al. discloses a method of manufacturing a semiconductor chip, identically corresponding to what is claimed.

Based on the amendment to claims 1 and 4, Applicant submits that Wada et al. does not disclose all the limitations recited in claims 1 and 4, and therefore, does not have identical disclosure of each element of the claimed invention in the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102.

Wada et al. does not disclose the step of “providing an array of substrates including a plurality of **individual substrates connected together by one or more segments**” recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). What Wada et al. discloses is a **single substrate** (matrix substrate 1A or 1B) on which a plurality of semiconductor chip are mounted (see column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 11). The matrix substrate shown in Wada et al. does not include a plurality of individual substrates connected together by one or more segments.

Therefore, Wada et al. fails to identically describe the limitation recited in claims 1-4 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102.

Kim and Ferguson et al.

In the fourth enumerated paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner stated, “it is the Examiner’s opinion that previous Office Action citing the Kim patent and the Ferguson patent still read on the claimed invention” and “The Examiner also considered that such modification (Kim in view of Ferguson) would have been obviously contemplated by one ordinary skill in the art.”

In response, Applicant submits that Kim and Ferguson et al., either individually or in combination, do not disclose each and every limitation recited in claims 1-4. Specifically, Kim and Ferguson et al. do not disclose the limitation “providing an array of substrates including a plurality of individual substrates connected together **by one or more segments**” recited in claims 1 and 4 (emphasis added).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to carefully review the above difference between the claimed invention and the references.

Conclusion.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this

09/902,588

paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY



Stephen A. Becker
Registration No. 26,527

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 SAB:TT:lnm
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: December 30, 2003